

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 19, 22 and 23 have been amended to correct formality errors and to more clearly define the invention. Claim 24 is newly added.

The claims have been amended to more clearly define that the claimed system processes “activity” indications from individual applications “of a plurality of concurrently operating applications” and other features. Support for this and the other amendments and added claim is found in the existing claims and in the Application description on page 4 lines 27-30, page 14 line 31 to page 16 line 7, Figures 2, 4 11 and 12 and other places.

*I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)*

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,154,741 – Feldman in view of U.S. Patent 6,230,255 – Asghar et al.. These claims, as amended, are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 recites a system for “use in a first application concurrently operating together with a plurality of network compatible applications” and including, “an entitlement processor for enabling user access to a first application of a plurality of concurrently operating applications in response to validation of user identification information; and a communication processor employed by said first application of said plurality of concurrently operating applications for intermittently communicating an activity indication to a managing application within a timeout window, said activity indication being communicated sufficiently often to prevent an inactivity timeout of said first application being initiated by said managing application in response to said timeout window being exceeded”. These features are not shown or suggested in Feldman in combination with Asghar.

The system of amended claim 1 includes “a communication processor employed by said first application of said plurality of concurrently operating applications for intermittently communicating an activity indication to a managing application within a timeout window”. The “activity indication” is “communicated sufficiently often to prevent an inactivity timeout of said first application being initiated by said managing application in response to said timeout window being exceeded”. Neither Feldman nor Asghar, individually or together, suggest such

features. As recognized in the Rejection page 2 section 4, Feldman does not teach use of such a “communication processor”. Further, contrary to the Rejection statement made on page 3 (first sentence), neither Asghar nor Feldman, individually or in combination, suggest or contemplate such a “communication processor”. Specifically, neither Asghar nor Feldman alone or together show or suggest an individual “**first application**” of a “**plurality of concurrently operating applications**” for “intermittently communicating an activity indication to a **managing** application within a timeout window”.

The watchdog timer of Figure 2 and Figure 8 of Asghar relied on in the Rejection (Rejection page 3 first sentence) is a hardware function in which a hardware reset is generated. Specifically in Asghar, “The timer is permanently enabled, generating a 2 ms pulse on the RESET/ (active low) pin if it times out. Hardware internal to the communications processor is also reset by a watchdog timer 800 (FIG. 8) time-out; the result is identical to activating the RESET/pin. A hardware reset is generated to the communications processor 100 if a counter 802 is not cleared every 2 seconds. If counter 802 is not cleared, an output is generated to reset pulse generator 802. A specific key sequence must be written to a Watchdog Key Register 804 by the CPU 200 within this 2 seconds after reset, and within 2 seconds of the previous update to prevent time-out.” (Asghar column 10 lines 39-50).

Asghar shows that “Hardware internal to the communications processor” (the system of Figure 1 of Asghar) is “reset by a watchdog timer 800 (FIG. 8) time-out”. That is, in Asghar a “**hardware reset** is generated to the communications processor 100”. Therefore, Asghar merely shows a conventional watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware. Further, in Asghar, a “specific key sequence **must** be written to a Watchdog Key Register 804 by the CPU 200 within this 2 seconds after reset, and within 2 seconds of the previous update to prevent time-out” (Asghar column 10 lines 47-50). Asghar contains no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling description **at all** concerning what conditions may prevent “CPU 200” from writing the required “specific key sequence” within the “2 seconds after reset, and within 2 seconds of the previous update to prevent time-out”. Consequently, Asghar with Feldman fails to show or suggest an individual “**first application**” of a “**plurality of concurrently operating applications**” that is able to “intermittently” communicate an “activity indication to a **managing** application within a timeout window”.

Asghar with Feldman does not show or suggest use of an individual “first application” of a “plurality of concurrently operating applications” for activity functions at all. Similarly, Asghar with Feldman also fails to show or suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for receiving and processing an “intermittently” communicated “activity indication” within a “timeout window” provided by an

individual “first application” of a “plurality of concurrently operating applications”. This is because Asghar is concerned with a hardware reset and does not contemplate, discuss or mention **software** managed activity indications. Further, because the Asghar system generates a hardware reset, **all applications** of all operating sessions that are executing on the processor (processor 100 of Asghar) are reset. In contrast, the claim 1 system enables prevention of “a managing application” from initiating “an inactivity timeout” of an individual “first application” of a “plurality of concurrently operating applications” without initiating reset of applications of a different operating session operating on the same processor, for example.

In addition, the incorporation of the watchdog timer features of Asghar into the Feldman system, as suggested by the Rejection, results in a system for resetting all executable applications that are executing on a processor. This combined systems fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for receiving and processing an “intermittently” communicated “activity indication” within a “timeout window” provided by an individual “first application” of a “plurality of concurrently operating applications”. The combined system also fails to suggest preventing “a **managing** application” from initiating “an inactivity timeout” of the individual “first application” without initiating reset of applications of a different operating session operating on the same processor, for example. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 2 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest use of an “intermittently communicated activity indication” that “prevents an inactivity timeout of said plurality of concurrently operating applications of a particular **user initiated session**” (of potentially multiple sessions operating on the computer). As previously explained in connection with claim 1, the combined system of Asghar and Feldman fails to suggest (and is incapable of) preventing “a managing application” from initiating “an inactivity timeout” of an individual “first application” without initiating reset of applications of a different operating session operating on the same processor, for example. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 3 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 3 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest use of a “communication processor” that “stores a plurality of activity indications and sends said plurality of activity

indications as a **batch** to said managing application”. The combined system of Asghar with Feldman fails to provide a 35 USC 112 compliant enabling description concerning how “CPU 200” writes the required “specific key sequence” within the “2 seconds after reset, and within 2 seconds of the previous update to prevent time-out”. There is certainly no description or suggestion whatever of a “batch” mode which, would be incompatible with the hardware mechanism employed by Asghar. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 4 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 4 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest use of a “communication processor” that “intermittently communicates said activity indication to said managing application in response to a **user action** and said user action comprises at least one of, (a) keyboard activity, (b) mouse activity, (c) other data entry device activity; and (d) another user initiated PC application operation activity”. As previously explained, The combined system of Asghar with Feldman fails to provide a 35 USC 112 compliant enabling description concerning how “CPU 200” writes the required “specific key sequence” within the “2 seconds after reset, and within 2 seconds of the previous update to prevent time-out”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman fails to suggest “intermittently” communicating an “activity indication to said managing application in response to a **user action**” at all. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 5 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 5 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which the “first application and said managing application reside in the same PC” and “said activity indication notifies said managing application of activity by said first application and includes one or more of, (a) a session identifier for identifying a particular user initiated session, (b) a URL to be contacted if said activity notification is not successful, (c) an identification of a type of event preventing said activity notification from being successful”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing (or any suggestion of) the software processing features of claim 5. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest an “activity indication” that “notifies” a “managing application of activity by said first application and includes one or more of, (a) a **session identifier** for identifying a particular user

initiated session, (b) a **URL** to be contacted if said activity notification is not successful, (c) an identification of a **type of event** preventing said activity notification from being successful”. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 6 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 6 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which a “communication processor intermittently communicates activity indications to said managing application using a plurality of different commands including an activity notification command and a command involving at least one of, (a) determining a user operation session identifier from said managing application and (b) sending a **URL** to said managing application”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing (or any suggestion of) the software processing features of claim 6. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest “using a plurality of different commands including an activity notification command and a command involving at least one of, (a) determining a user operation **session identifier** from said managing application and (b) sending a **URL** to said managing application”. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 7 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 7 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which a “communication processor communicates to said managing application a request to receive an activity indication associated with said first application and maintained by said managing application, said activity indication indicating time since the last activity update”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing (or any suggestion of) the software processing features of claim 7. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest a “communication processor” that “communicates to said managing application a **request to receive an activity indication** associated with said first application and maintained by said managing application, said activity indication indicating time since the last activity update”. The Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for activity management at all, does not contemplate such a feature and is entirely incapable of

such a function. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 8 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 8 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which “individual applications of said plurality of concurrently operating applications independently intermittently communicate an activity indication to said managing application and said communication processor communicates with a browser application providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification information for validation by said entitlement processor”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing (or any suggestion of) the software processing features of claim 8. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest “**individual applications** of said plurality of concurrently operating applications” that “**independently** intermittently communicate an activity indication to said managing application”. The Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for activity management at all. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 8 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 9 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 9 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which “said communication processor communicates a time-out threshold value comprising said timeout window to said managing application”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing (or any suggestion of) the software processing features of claim 9. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest a “communication processor” that “communicates a **time-out threshold value** comprising said timeout window to said managing application”. The Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for activity management at all. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 10 recites a system for “use by a managing application supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of Internet compatible applications, comprising: an input processor for intermittently receiving activity indications from a plurality of concurrently operating applications; an activity monitor

for updating individual activity status indicators, corresponding to said plurality of concurrently operating applications, in response to said received activity indications; a comparator for comparing individual activity status indicators with corresponding time-out threshold values to identify an application time-out event indicated by a status indicator exceeding said time-out threshold; and a communication processor for communicating notice of said application time-out event to one of said plurality of concurrently operating applications”. These features are not shown or suggested in Feldman in combination with Asghar.

Amended independent claim 10 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 10 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system used “by a managing application” involving “intermittently receiving activity indications from a plurality of concurrently operating applications” and including an “activity monitor for updating individual activity status indicators, corresponding to said plurality of concurrently operating applications, in response to said received activity indications”. As previously explained, the combined system of Asghar with Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing, or any suggestion of, the software processing features of claim 10. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest “a system used “by a managing application” involving “intermittently receiving activity indications from a plurality of concurrently operating applications” and including an “activity monitor for **updating individual activity status indicators**, corresponding to said plurality of concurrently operating applications, in response to said received activity indications”. The Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for activity management at all. Similarly, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest “a comparator for comparing individual activity status indicators with **corresponding** time-out threshold values to identify an application time-out event indicated by a status indicator exceeding said time-out threshold; and a communication processor for communicating notice of said application time-out event to one of said plurality of concurrently operating applications”. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 11 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 10 and for reasons given in connection with claim 10 and claim 4. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 12 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 10. Claim 12 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which “an activity status indicator comprises a time indication identifying when activity of a particular application was last reported, and said time-out threshold comprises a predetermined time duration and said managing application determines said particular application to be inactive if said time indication exceeds said time-out threshold”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing or any suggestion of the software processing features of claim 12. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest communication of “an activity status indicator” that comprises a “time indication identifying when **activity** of a particular application was **last reported**, and said time-out threshold comprises a predetermined time duration and said managing application determines said particular application to be inactive if said time indication exceeds said time-out threshold”. The Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for activity management or any ability (or any suggestion) to process activity indications for **individual** executable applications at all. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 13 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 10 and for reasons given in connection with claim 10 and claim 6. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 14 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 10. Claim 14 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which “said communication processor communicates **notice** of said application time-out event to applications of said plurality of concurrently operating applications that have previously requested a notification of session termination”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing or any suggestion of the software processing features of claim 12. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest communication of “notice of said application time-out event to applications of said plurality of concurrently operating applications that have previously requested a notification of session termination”. The Asghar system with



Feldman fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for activity management or any ability (or any suggestion) to process activity indications for **individual** executable applications at all. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 15 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 10. Claim 15 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which “said communication processor communicates notice of said application time-out event in response to at least one condition of, (a) a received command requesting notification and (b) a received communication from an application session having previously produced a time-out event and (c) automatically upon generation of said time-out event”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing or any suggestion of the software processing features of claim 12. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest communication of “**notice** of said application time-out event in response to at least one condition of, (a) a **received command** requesting notification and (b) a **received communication** from an application session having previously produced a time-out event and (c) **automatically** upon **generation** of said time-out event”. The Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for communication of “notice of said application time-out event” at all. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 16 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 10 and for reasons given in connection with claim 10 and claim 5. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 17 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 10. Claim 17 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which “said corresponding time-out threshold values comprise a common timeout period for said plurality of concurrently operating applications”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing or any suggestion of the software processing features of claim 12. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to

suggest a system in which “said corresponding time-out threshold values” comprise a “**common** timeout period for said **plurality of concurrently** operating applications”. The Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” employing “a common timeout period for said plurality of concurrently operating applications” for executable application activity management at all. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 18 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 10. Claim 18 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which “said comparator uses a predetermined default value for said time-out threshold values” in combination with the features of claim 10. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 19 recites a system “supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of Internet compatible applications, comprising: a browser application providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification information and commands for a plurality of Internet compatible applications; and a managing application for receiving activity indications from a plurality of concurrently operating applications, said plurality of concurrently operating applications being initiated by user commands via said browser user interface, said received activity indications being provided by individual applications sufficiently frequently to prevent an inactivity timeout of said individual applications”. These features are not shown or suggested in Feldman in combination with Asghar.

Amended independent claim 19 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 19 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest use of “a **browser** application providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification information and commands for a plurality of Internet compatible applications; and a managing application for receiving activity indications from a plurality of concurrently operating applications, said plurality of concurrently operating applications being initiated by user commands via said browser user interface, said received **activity indications** being provided by **individual applications** sufficiently frequently to prevent an inactivity timeout of said individual applications”. As previously explained, the combined system of Asghar with Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any

capability for providing, or any suggestion of, the software processing features of claim 19. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest “a browser application providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification information and commands for a plurality of Internet compatible applications; and a managing application for receiving activity indications from a plurality of concurrently operating applications, said plurality of concurrently operating applications being initiated by user commands via said browser user interface, said received activity indications being provided by individual applications sufficiently frequently to prevent an inactivity timeout of said individual applications”. The Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest use of a centralized “managing application” for activity management of individual concurrently operating executable applications at all. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 19 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 20 and 21 are considered to be patentable based on their dependence on claim 19 and because of the additional feature combinations that they incorporate and for reasons given in connection with previous claims. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of amended claim 20 and 21 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent method claims 22 and 23 mirror apparatus claims 10 and 11 respectively and are considered to be patentable for the same reasons.

Added independent method claim 24 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 10 and for additional reasons. Claim 24 is also considered to be patentable because Feldman with Asghar does not show or suggest a system in which “intermittently receiving activity indications from a plurality of concurrently operating applications of a particular operating session of a user; updating a single activity status indicator associated with said plurality of concurrently operating applications of said particular operating session, in response to said received activity indications; comparing said single activity status indicator with a time-out threshold value to identify a time-out event indicated by a status indicator exceeding said time-out threshold; and re-initializing said plurality of concurrently operating applications in response to said comparison”. The combined system of Asghar and Feldman shows a conventional hardware watch dog timer for resetting processor hardware without any capability for providing (or any suggestion of) the software processing features of claim 24. Specifically, the Asghar system with Feldman fails to suggest “updating a **single activity status** indicator associated with

said plurality of concurrently operating applications of said particular operating session, in response" to "intermittently" received "activity indications from a plurality of concurrently operating applications of a **particular operating session of a user**". These features advantageously enable an individual executable application to keep alive "concurrently operating applications" of a "particular operating session". Therefore if a user is heavily using one application of the "concurrently operating applications" the other applications are kept alive and do not result in inactivation of a user's operational session. The Asghar system with Feldman is a hardware function with no capability (or suggestion) of enabling a particular application to toll an inactivity time out period for a "plurality of concurrently operating applications" of a "particular operating session". Consequently, it is submitted added claim 24 is patentable over the cited references.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Alexander J. Burke

Date: April 30, 2004

Reg. No. 40,425

Alexander J. Burke  
Intellectual Property Department  
Siemens Corporation,  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, N.J. 08830  
Tel. 732 321 3023  
Fax 732 321 3030

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on 30 April 2004.

  
Alexander J. Burke

30 April 2004  
Date